

PROPOSITION 77

Redistricting. Initiative
Constitutional Amendment.

Proponents: Edward J. (Ted) Costa, Dr. Arthur Laffer,
Major General Sidney S. Novaresi (USAF) Ret.,
and Jimmie Johnson

Date: August 15, 2005
(RE-ISSUED PURSUANT TO COURT
ORDER DATED AUGUST 12, 2005.)

BALLOT LABEL

**REDISTRICTING. INITIATIVE
CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.**

Amends state Constitution's process for redistricting California's Senate, Assembly, Congressional and Board of Equalization districts. Requires three-member panel of retired judges selected by legislative leaders.
Fiscal Impact: One-time state redistricting costs totaling no more than \$1.5 million and county costs in the range of \$1 million. Potential reduction in future costs, but net impact would depend on decisions by voters.

**SUBJECT TO COURT
ORDERED CHANGES**

Proposition 77
Reapportionment. Initiative Constitutional Amendment.

Yes/No Statement

A YES vote on this measure means: Boundaries for political districts would be drawn by retired judges and approved by voters at statewide elections. A redistricting plan would be developed for use following the measure's approval and then following each future federal census.

A NO vote on this measure means: Boundaries for political districts would continue to be drawn by the Legislature and approved by the Governor. A redistricting plan would be developed following each future federal census.

**SUBJECT TO COURT
ORDERED CHANGES**

BALLOT MEASURE SUMMARY INFORMATION

Argument in favor against (circle one) of proposition # 77

Include text of summary argument here (50 word maximum):

See print document

"Whom to Contact for More Information".

(This information will appear in the voter information guide)

Contact Name: Edward S. Costa

Organization: People's Advocate

Address: 3407 Arden Way

Phone: 982 6175

E-mail: emily@peoplesadvocate.org

Web site: _____

**SUBJECT TO COURT
ORDERED CHANGES**

PROPOSITION 77 MAKES POLITICIANS ACCOUNTABLE TO THE PEOPLE.
Yes on Prop. 77 guarantees fair, competitive elections by ensuring voters have the final say on voting districts – not politicians. Prop 77 reduces special interest influence and holds politicians accountable to their constituents. Fair Districts, Real Competition - Yes on 77.

**SUBJECT TO COURT
ORDERED CHANGES**

BALLOT MEASURE SUMMARY INFORMATION

Argument in favor against (circle one) of proposition # 77.

Include text of summary argument here (50 word maximum):

Sponsors want you to believe Prop 77 makes government better. Don't be fooled!

Read the fine print: Voters lose their right to reject redistricting before it becomes effective; politicians pick judges to draw districts for them; it costs taxpayers millions; and is cemented into our Constitution.

Vote No on 77!

"Whom to Contact for More Information".

(This information will appear in the voter information guide)

Contact Name: _____

Organization: _____

Address: _____

Phone: _____

E-mail: _____

Web site: _____

Californians For Fair Representation - No on 77

1127 - 11th Street, Suite 950

Sacramento CA 95814

916 - 448 - 7724

www.noonproposition77.com

SUBJECT TO COURT
ORDERED CHANGES

PROPOSITION 77

Redistricting Initiative
Constitutional Amendment.

Proponents: Edward J. (Ted) Costa, Dr. Arthur Laffer,
Major General Sidney S. Novaresi (USAF) Ret.,
and Jimmie Johnson

Date: August 15, 2005
(RE-ISSUED PURSUANT TO COURT
ORDER DATED AUGUST 12, 2005.)

BALLOT TITLE AND SUMMARY

**REDISTRICTING. INITIATIVE
CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.**

- Amends process for redistricting California's Senate, Assembly, Congressional and Board of Equalization districts.
- Requires panel of three retired judges, selected by legislative leaders, to adopt new redistricting plan if measure passes and after each national census.
- Panel must consider legislative, public comments/hold public hearings.
- Redistricting plan effective when adopted by panel and filed with Secretary of State; governs next statewide primary/general elections even if voters reject plan.
- If voters reject redistricting plan, process repeats, but officials elected under rejected plan serve full terms.
- Allows 45 days to seek judicial review of adopted redistricting plan.

**Summary of Legislative Analyst's Estimate of
Net State and Local Government Fiscal Impact:**

- One-time costs for a redistricting plan. State costs totaling no more than \$1.5 million and county costs in the range of \$1 million.
- Potential reduction in costs for each redistricting effort after 2010, but net impact would depend on decisions by voters.

**SUBJECT TO COURT
ORDERED CHANGES**

Proposition 77
Reapportionment. Initiative Constitutional Amendment.

Background

Every ten years, the federal census counts the number of people living in California. The California Constitution requires the Legislature after each census to adjust the boundaries of the districts used to elect public officials. This process is called "redistricting" (or sometimes "reapportionment"). The primary purpose of redistricting is to establish districts which are "reasonably equal" in population. Redistricting affects districts for the state Legislature (Assembly and Senate), Board of Equalization (BOE), and the U.S. House of Representatives.

Typically, redistricting plans are included in legislation and become law after passage of the bill by the Legislature and signature by the Governor. In the past, when the Legislature and Governor have been unable to agree on redistricting plans, the California Supreme Court oversaw the redistricting.

Proposal

This measure amends the California Constitution to change the redistricting process for the state Legislature, BOE, and California members of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Panel of Retired Judges. This measure requires that a three-member panel of retired federal and/or state judges ("special masters") develop redistricting plans. The measure requires that the judges meet a number of criteria, including that they have never held

**SUBJECT TO COURT
ORDERED CHANGES**

partisan political office. (The nearby box provides more detail on the selection process for the special masters.)

Requirements of District Boundaries. The measure adds new requirements regarding the drawing of district boundaries. Among these requirements are:

- For the Legislature and BOE, population differences among districts cannot exceed 1 percent.
- Senate districts must be comprised of two adjacent Assembly districts, and BOE districts must be comprised of ten adjacent Senate districts.
- The plan must minimize the splitting of counties and cities into multiple districts.

In addition, when drawing boundaries, the panel could not consider information related to political party affiliations and other specified matters.

Schedule. A panel would be required to develop a redistricting plan for use at the next primary and general elections following the measure's approval and then following each future federal census.

Approval Process. In developing a plan, the panel would have to hold public hearings and could receive suggested plans from the public and the Legislature. Once the panel unanimously approves a redistricting plan, the plan would be used for the next primary and general elections. The Secretary of State would place the plan on the general election ballot for the voters to consider. If the voters approve the plan, it would

be used until the next redistricting is required. If the voters reject the plan, another panel would be appointed to prepare a new plan for the next primary and general elections.

Funding. The measure specifies that the Legislature must make funding available from the Legislature's budget (which is limited under the State Constitution) to support the work of the panel. This could include employment of legal and other experts in the field of redistricting and computer technology. Funding for the panel would be limited to a maximum of one-half of the amount spent by the Legislature on redistricting in 2001 (adjusted for inflation beginning after the 2010 federal census). For the first redistricting plan under the measure (to be developed for use at the next primary and general elections following the measure's approval), the funding would be provided from the state General Fund.

Fiscal Effects

Panel Allowable Costs. The Legislature spent about \$3 million in 2001 on redistricting. This measure would limit panel costs for future redistricting efforts to half of this amount, adjusted for inflation. Therefore, the maximum amount allowable under the measure for each future panel would be about \$1.5 million.

One-Time Redistricting Costs. Under existing law, the next redistricting plan would not be developed until after the 2010 federal census. The measure, however, requires that a redistricting plan be developed for use at the next primary election following the measure's approval. This additional redistricting plan would result in one-time state

**SUBJECT TO COURT
ORDERED CHANGES**

costs, which would total no more than \$1.5 million for the panel's work. In addition, counties would experience some added one-time costs to implement the new district boundaries. These costs could be in the range of \$1 million.

Impact on Future Redistricting Costs. The preparation of future redistricting plans (after 2010) under the measure would be on the same schedule as existing law. Due to the measure's limit on a panel's redistricting costs, there could be a reduction in the total amount the state spent for each redistricting effort. Any such savings would be available for other legislative expenses under the existing cap. If, however, voters rejected any redistricting plan, there would be some additional state and county costs for a new plan to be developed and implemented. Thus, the net impact on future redistricting costs in any decade would depend on decisions by voters.

Election Costs. Because the measure requires the redistricting plans to be approved by voters, it would result in costs to the state and counties each time a plan was placed on the ballot. These costs primarily would be related to preparing and mailing election-related materials. Since the approval of the plans could be consolidated with existing elections, the increased costs of the measure would probably be minor.

**SUBJECT TO COURT
ORDERED CHANGES**

Major Steps to Select Redistricting Panel Under Proposition 77

1. Judicial Council (an administrative body of the court system) collects list of retired judges willing to serve on a panel. The judges must not have:
 - Held partisan political office.
 - Changed their party affiliation since their judicial appointment.
 - Received income over the past year from specified political sources.
2. Judicial Council randomly selects a pool of 24 judges from the list of volunteers. The two largest political parties must have equal representation.
3. The four legislative leaders (two each from the majority and minority parties) nominate a total of 12 judges from the pool. The leaders each nominate three judges with party affiliations different than their own. Each leader is then able to eliminate one of the nominated judges.
4. From the nominated judges remaining on the list, three judges are selected at random to serve as the panel. Each of the two largest political parties must have at least one representative.
5. The selected judges pledge, in writing, to not run for offices affected by the districts they draw or accept public jobs (other than judicial or teaching) for the next five years.

**SUBJECT TO COURT
ORDERED CHANGES**

THE TIME FOR ACCOUNTABILITY IS NOW!

PROPOSITION 77: "THE VOTER EMPOWERMENT ACT"

WILL FINALLY MAKE POLITICIANS ACCOUNTABLE TO THE PEOPLE.

- Guarantee fair election districts for Californians.**
- Give voters the final say in the process.**
- Reduce special interest influence and money in politics.**

YES On Prop. 77: Let the Voters Decide.

The Problem: California's flawed election system allows partisan politicians to draw the boundary lines of their own districts -- splitting up towns and even neighborhoods for personal gain. The result: there is no accountability because the incumbents rig the districts to ensure they have NO serious competition, guaranteed re-election, and are NOT accountable to voters.

It used to be that voters picked their politicians – now politicians pick their voters.

And that's NOT FAIR.

"California lawmakers are so adept at designing their own districts that of the 153 seats – 80 Assembly, 20 state Senate, 53 Congressional – theoretically up for grabs last November (2004), not a single one switched parties."

Wall Street Journal, March 11, 2005

When politicians are not accountable to voters, they become accountable only to their special interest campaign contributors.

**SUBJECT TO COURT
ORDERED CHANGES**

That's why we still have record deficits, unbalanced budgets, out of control spending and calls for higher taxes, year after year.

Wouldn't it be better if legislators would work to improve education, cut wasteful government spending, eliminate bureaucracy, and balance the budget once and for all? But that won't happen until our elected officials start paying attention to us. Under the current system, they only pay attention to their campaign contributors. It's time for a change.

Prop. 77 – The Bi-Partisan Voter Empowerment Solution

1. Voters will be able to vote on the new redistricting plan. That gives the people of California more power and the special interests less.

2. To ensure district lines that are competitive and fair, a panel of retired judges - selected through a bi-partisan process with no political agenda - will draw new district lines according to strict guidelines.

3. Voters then may approve or reject the lines. That puts us, Californians, in charge of our elections.

4. Neighborhoods and communities will matter again. Incumbents will no longer be able to draw their own districts, splitting up towns and neighborhoods in an effort to guarantee their own re-election.

Prop. 77 IS A COMMON SENSE, BI-PARTISAN SOLUTION THAT WILL:

**SUBJECT TO COURT
ORDERED CHANGES**

- Guarantee fair, competitive elections for California voters.
- Give voters the final say in the process.
- Hold the politicians accountable.
- Reduce the influence of political money.

Now is the time. After many years of opposing reform, overspending and gridlock, legislative leaders of both parties finally admitted, this year, that redistricting reform is necessary - that allowing politicians to draw their own districts is a conflict of interest that must be changed.

The opportunity is now. PLEASE JOIN US IN VOTING YES ON PROP. 77 TO:

- HOLD THE POLITICANS ACCOUNTABLE!
- CLEAN UP SACRAMENTO.
- REDUCE PARTISAN POLITICS.
- RETURN ELECTORAL CONTROL TO THE PEOPLE.

EDWARD J. "TED" COSTA, CEO, People's Advocate

ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, Governor, State of California

JOHN A. ARGUELLES, Former California Supreme Court Justice

**SUBJECT TO COURT
ORDERED CHANGES**

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF

PROPOSITION 77

The people behind Prop 77 want you to believe it will make things better.

Don't be fooled!

Special interests spent millions of dollars to force a special election and put this loophole-ridden redistricting scheme on the ballot.

In fact, two courts and three judges have already ruled that this measure shouldn't even be on the ballot. They ruled that proponents broke the law in a rush to have a new redistricting and reapportionment 5 years earlier than normal.

This flawed plan won't make politicians more accountable... they pick the judges!

Read the fine print.

- 1) PROP 77 TAKES AWAY THE RIGHT OF VOTERS to reject redistricting plans *before* they go into effect.
- 2) The so-called *independent* redistricting judges are HAND-PICKED BY POLITICIANS.
- 3) Every time voters reject these redistricting plans, IT WILL COST TAXPAYERS MILLIONS.
- 4) Everything is decided by a small panel of ONLY THREE UNELECTED JUDGES.
- 5) This flawed idea is CEMENTED INTO OUR CONSTITUTION.

Politicians have tried to sneak redistricting schemes past voters four times in the last 25 years. VOTERS SAID NO.... all four times.

Instead of putting up a straight-forward plan that makes sense, they offer us this unfair and undemocratic redistricting measure.

Vote NO on Prop 77. It can only make things worse.

SUBJECT TO COURT ORDERED CHANGES

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF

PROPOSITION 77

www.NoOnProposition77.com

DANIEL H. LOWENSTEIN -

Former Chair

Fair Political Practices Commission

DEBORAH BURGER -

President

California Nurses Association

HENRY L. "HANK" LACAYO -

State President

Congress of California Seniors

SUBJECT TO COURT
ORDERED CHANGES

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 77

Proposition 77 Makes Things Worse

Every time they don't get their way, politicians cook up new schemes to change the rules. They've tried sneaking redistricting schemes past voters four times over the last 25 years, and each time, VOTERS SAID NO!

This time, their plan will cost taxpayers millions, and three judges and two courts have ruled it was illegally qualified for the ballot.

Don't be fooled! *Read the fine print.* This undemocratic and unfair redistricting scheme has huge loopholes.

BIG FLAWS:

- 1) VOTERS LOSE THEIR RIGHT to reject redistricting plans before they go into effect.
- 2) POLITICIANS SELECT THE JUDGES to draw their districts for them.
- 3) Prop 77 COSTS TAXPAYERS MILLIONS each time they reject redistricting plans.
- 4) Only 3 UNELECTED JUDGES WILL DECIDE EVERYTHING. That's not fair or balanced.
- 5) This unworkable scheme will be CEMENTED INTO OUR CONSTITUTION!

PLANS TAKE EFFECT WITHOUT VOTER APPROVAL

Redistricting plans made from Prop 77 automatically go into effect WITH NO APPROVAL FROM VOTERS. That's backwards. Voters should approve plans BEFORE they take effect, not afterward. By the time voters have a say, the damage is done. Why won't they let voters approve the plans first?

POLITICIANS STILL IN CONTROL

Under Prop 77, politicians in the Legislature choose the judges to draw their political

SUBJECT TO COURT ORDERED CHANGES

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 77

districts. Politicians get the best of both worlds – they still pick their voters and now they can hide behind judges. There's no accountability!

REQUIRES MULTIPLE COSTLY ELECTIONS

If voters reject redistricting plans, the entire process starts over – new judges, new plans, more elections, and more political bickering – wasting millions of tax dollars. This could go on indefinitely... with election after election... until voters finally approve... all at *TAXPAYER EXPENSE!*

GIVES TOO MUCH POWER TO JUST 3 UNACCOUNTABLE JUDGES

This redistricting scheme gives too much power to three retired judges to decide the future of 35 million Californians. These unelected judges have nothing to fear by upsetting the will of the voters.

NOT THE WAY TO CHANGE OUR CONSTITUTION

Prop 77 changes our Constitution. But the Constitution is not a place to experiment with California's future. They're playing political games with a sacred document.

MOST AREAS OF THE STATE UNREPRESENTED

Under Prop 77, all three judges could be from the same area. That's not fair. For example, three Northern California judges could break up Southern California communities, or vice versa. Central Valley voters could have no redistricting panel representation at all!

What effect would this have on regional issues like *WATER RIGHTS* and *TRANSPORTATION FUNDING?*

WHY NOW? WHAT'S THEIR MOTIVE?

Redistricting isn't scheduled to occur until 2011, after the Census gives an update on

**SUBJECT TO COURT
ORDERED CHANGES**

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 77

California's population. Instead, special interests spent millions of dollars to rush this strange plan onto the special election ballot. What's their motive?

We do need to reform our government, but Prop 77 isn't the answer.

VOTE NO ON PROP 77. IT WON'T MAKE ANYTHING BETTER.

www.NoOnProposition77.com

DANIEL H. LOWENSTEIN, *Former Chair*

Fair Political Practices Commission

JUDGE GEORGE H. ZENOVICH, *Associate Justice Retired*

5th District Court of Appeal

HENRY L. "HANK" LACAYO, *State President*

Congress of California Seniors

SUBJECT TO COURT
ORDERED CHANGES

~~Governor Schwarzenegger's~~

~~★★ California Recovery Team ★★~~

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST

PROPOSITION 77

~~Proposition 77~~

~~"The Voter Empowerment Act"~~

~~Pro Rebuttal Argument~~

Opponents of Prop. 77, the "Voter Empowerment Act", are desperate to protect entrenched politicians and the status quo. They have historically fought to prevent voters' voices from being heard, even trying to keep Prop. 77 off the ballot this year!

PROP. 77 WILL RETURN POWER TO THE VOTERS, AWAY FROM POLITICIANS AND SPECIAL INTERESTS WHO CURRENTLY CONTROL OUR UNFAIR ELECTION SYSTEM – IT GIVES VOTERS THE FINAL SAY.

When politicians are virtually guaranteed to win elections, they are not accountable to voters. Prop. 77 fixes this problem and improves California's election system – ensuring all voters are fairly represented.

Beware of the smokescreen arguments by opponents of Prop. 77. Remember these important facts:

- Opponents don't want competitive elections. They like the status quo and will do anything to protect their power.
- They want the politicians to continue protecting their special interests at the expense of California's working families.
- Voter approval of redistricting plans will be held at regularly scheduled elections, so opponents' claims of huge election costs are false.

Prop. 77 is simple and straightforward:

- A bi-partisan panel of retired judges would establish new, fair district boundaries for the Legislature and Congress.
- They want the politicians to continue protecting their special interests at the expense of California's working families.
- Fair districts mean competitive elections. Competitive elections ensure our elected officials listen to citizen voices and not just campaign contributors.

Nothing could be fairer than letting voters have the final word!

SUBJECT TO COURT
ORDERED CHANGES

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST

PROPOSITION 77

"YES" ON PROP. 77 – IT'S ABOUT RETURNING POWER TO THE PEOPLE

John Kehoe, Policy Director, California Senior Advocates League

Julie Vandermost, President, California Women's Leadership Association

Nativo Lopez, President, , Mexican American Political Association

SUBJECT TO COURT
ORDERED CHANGES

Prop 77

1072 Jeff
to SOS
7-1
JD

This initiative measure is submitted to the people in accordance with the provisions of Article II, Section 8 of the California Constitution.

This initiative measure expressly amends the California Constitution by amending sections thereof; therefore, existing provisions proposed to be deleted are printed in ~~strikeout type~~ and new provisions proposed to be added are printed in *italic type* to indicate that they are new.

PROPOSED LAW

SUBJECT TO COURT
ORDERED CHANGES

SA2004RFOO37
Amndt #1-NS

REDISTRICTING REFORM: THE VOTER EMPOWERMENT ACT

INITIATIVE MEASURE TO BE SUBMITTED DIRECTLY TO VOTERS

SECTION 1. Findings and Declarations of Purpose

The People of the State of California find and declare that:

citizens of the State of California, and not the self-interest of individual legislators or the partisan interests of political parties.

(a) Our Legislature should be responsive to the demands of the voters, but existing law places the power to draw the very districts, in which legislators are elected, in the hands of incumbent state legislators, who then choose their voters, which is a conflict of interest.

have resulted in

(b) ~~The Legislature's self-interest in drawing its members' districts has resulted in~~ partisan gerrymandering, uncompetitive districts, ideological polarization, and a growing division between the interests of the People of California and their elected representatives.

and disconnect in our institutions of representative democracy

(c) The redistricting plans adopted by the California Legislature in 2001 produced an unprecedented number of uncompetitive districts, serve incumbents, and not the People, and are repugnant to the People. The gerrymandered districts of 2001 resulted in not a single change in the partisan composition of the California Legislature or the California congressional delegation in the 2004 elections. These districts should be replaced as soon as possible and never used again, and are in direct opposition to the People's interest in fair and competitive elections. They should not be used again.

(d) The experience of the 1970's and 1990's demonstrates that impartial special masters, who are retired judges independent of partisan politics and the Legislature, can draw fair and competitive districts by virtue of their judicial training and judicial temperament.

(e) We demand that our representative system of government assure that the voters choose their representatives, rather than their representatives choose their voters, that it be open to public scrutiny, and free of conflicts of interest, and that the system embody the principle that government derives its power from the consent of the governed. Therefore, the People of the State of California hereby adopt the "Redistricting Reform: The Voter Empowerment Act."

be fair to all,

dedicated to

SECTION 2. Fair Redistricting

Article XXI of the California Constitution is amended to read (added language shown in underline text, deleted language shown in strike-out text):

~~Section 1 of~~

SUBJECT TO COURT ORDERED CHANGES

Section 1.

Article Section 1. (a) Except as provided in subdivision (b), in the year following the year in which the national census is taken under the direction of Congress at the beginning of each decade, a panel of Special Masters composed of retired judges shall adjust the boundary lines of the Senatorial, Assembly, Congressional, and Board of Equalization districts in accordance with the standards and provisions of this article.

(b) Within 20 days following the effective date of this section, the Legislature shall appoint pursuant to the provisions of subdivision (c) paragraph (2) of a panel of Special Masters to adopt a plan of redistricting adjusting the boundary lines of the Senatorial, Assembly, Congressional, and Board of Equalization districts for use in the next set of statewide primary and general elections and until the next adjustment of boundary lines is required pursuant to this article. The panel shall establish a schedule and deadlines to ensure timely adoption of the plan. Except for subdivisions (a) or (i) of subdivision (c) paragraph (1), all provisions of this article shall apply to the adoption of the plan required by this subdivision.

paragraph (2) of (c)(1) Except as provided in subdivision (b), on or before January 15 of the year following the year in which the national census is taken, the Legislature shall appoint pursuant to the provisions of subdivision (c) paragraph (2) of a panel of Special Masters composed of retired judges to adopt a plan of redistricting adjusting the boundary lines of the Senatorial, Assembly, Congressional, and Board of Equalization districts pursuant to this Article.

nominate 24 (2)(A) In sufficient time to allow the appointment of the Special Masters, the Judicial Council shall select by lot 24 retired judges willing to serve as Special Masters. Only retired California state or federal judges, who have never held elected partisan public office or political party office, have not changed their party affiliation, as declared on their voter registration affidavit, since their initial appointment or election to judicial office, and have not received income during the past 12 months from the Legislature, a committee thereof, the United States Congress, a committee thereof, a political party, or a partisan candidate or committee controlled by such candidate, are qualified to serve as Special Masters. 12 Not more than twelve of the 24 retired judges may be of a single party affiliation, and the two largest political parties in California shall be equally represented among the selected retired judges. 12 nominate

(B) A retired judge selected appointed to serve as a Special Master shall also pledge, in writing, that he or she will not run for election in the Senatorial, Assembly, Congressional, or Board of Equalization districts adjusted by him or her pursuant to this Article nor accept, for at least 5 five years from the date of appointment as a Special Master, California state public employment or public office, other than judicial employment or judicial office or a teaching position.

(C) From the pool of retired judges selected nominate by the Judicial Council, the Speaker of the Assembly, the Minority Leader of the Assembly, the President pro Tempore of the Senate, and the Minority Leader of the Senate shall each nominate, no later than six five days before the deadline

SUBJECT TO COURT
ORDERED CHANGES

not represented from the list
of remaining nominees

for appointment of the panel of Special Masters, three retired judges, who are not registered members of the same political party as that of the legislator making the nomination. No retired judge may be nominated by more than one legislator.

(D) If, for any reason, any of the aforementioned legislative leadership fails to nominate the requisite number of retired judges within the time period specified herein, the Chief Clerk of the Assembly shall immediately draw, by lot, that legislator's remaining nominees in accordance with the requirements of subdivision (c)(2)(E).

three

subparagraph (E) of paragraph (2) of

(E) No later than ~~four~~ days before the deadline for appointment of the panel of Special Masters, each legislator authorized to nominate a retired judge shall also be entitled to exercise a single peremptory challenge striking the name of any nominee of any other legislator.

(F) From the list of remaining nominees selected by said legislative leadership, the Chief Clerk of the Assembly shall then draw, by lot, three persons to serve as Special Masters. If the drawing fails to produce at least one Special Master from each of the two largest political parties, the drawing shall be conducted again until this requirement is met. If ~~said list of remaining nominees does not include a retired judge~~ from each of the two largest political parties, the drawing for the Special Master from the ~~absent~~ political party or parties shall be made from the original pool of ~~twenty-four~~ retired judges selected by the Judicial Council, except that no retired judge whose name was struck pursuant to subdivision (c)(2)(E) may be appointed. In the event of a vacancy in the panel of Special Masters, the Chief Clerk shall immediately thereafter draw, by lot, from the list of remaining nominees selected by said legislative leadership, or the original pool of ~~twenty-four~~ retired judges, if necessary, except for those whose names were struck, a replacement who satisfies the composition requirements for the panel under this subdivision.

the drawing is
unable to
produce at
least one
Special Master

nominated
subparagraph
(E) of
paragraph
(2) of

24

(d) Each Special Master shall be compensated at the same rate for each day engaged in official duties, and reimbursed for actual and necessary expenses, including travel expenses, in the same manner as a member of the California Citizens Compensation Commission pursuant to of Section 8, subdivision (j) of Article III. The Special Masters' term of office shall expire upon approval or rejection of a plan pursuant to subdivision (h).

(e) Each Special Master shall be subject to the same restrictions on gifts as imposed on a retired judge of the superior court serving in the assigned judges program, and shall file a statement of economic interest, or any successor document, to the same extent and in the same manner as such a retired judge.

(f)(1) Public notice shall be given of all meetings of the Special Masters, and the Special Masters shall be deemed a state body subject to the provisions of the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act (Government Code §§ 11120-11132), or any successor act, as amended from time to time; provided that all meetings and sessions of the Special Masters shall be recorded. The

(Article 9 (commencing with Section 11120) of Chapter 1 of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code)

549

**SUBJECT TO COURT
ORDERED CHANGES**

Special Masters shall establish procedures that restrict ex parte communications from members of the public and the Legislature concerning the merits of any redistricting plan.

(2) The panel of Special Masters shall establish and publish a schedule to receive and consider proposed redistricting plans and public comment from any member of the Legislature or public. The panel of Special Masters shall hold at least three public hearings throughout the state to consider redistricting plans. At least one such hearing shall be held after the Special Masters have submitted their proposed redistricting plan pursuant to subdivision (f)(3), but before adoption of the final plan.

paragraph (3) of

(3) Before the adoption of a final redistricting plan, the Special Masters shall submit their plan to the Legislature for an opportunity to comment within the time set by the Special Masters. The Special Masters shall address in writing each change to their plan that is recommended by the Legislature and incorporated into the plan.

(g) The final redistricting plan shall be approved by a single resolution adopted unanimously by the Special Masters and shall become effective upon its filing with the Secretary of State for use at the next statewide primary and general elections, and if adopted by initiative pursuant to subdivision (h), shall remain effective for succeeding elections until the next adjustment of boundaries is required pursuant to this article.

elections

(h) The Secretary of State shall submit the final redistricting plan as if it were proposed as an initiative statute under Section 8 of Article II at the same next general election as specified under subdivision (g) for approval or rejection by the voters for use in succeeding elections until the next adjustment of boundaries is required. The ballot title shall read: "Shall the boundary lines of the Senatorial, Assembly, Congressional, and Board of Equalization districts adopted by Special Masters as required by Article XXI of the California Constitution, and used for this election, be used until the next constitutionally required adjustment of the boundaries?"

provided for

(i) If the redistricting plan is approved by the voters pursuant to subdivision (h) hereof, it shall be used in succeeding elections until the next adjustment of boundaries is required. If the plan is rejected by the voters pursuant to subdivision (h) hereof, a new panel of Special Masters shall be appointed within 90 days in the manner provided in subdivision (c)(2) for the purpose of proposing a new plan for the next statewide primary and general elections pursuant to this article. Any officials elected under a final redistricting plan shall serve out their term of office notwithstanding the voters' disapproval of the plan for use in succeeding primary and general elections.

paragraph (2) of

elections

(j) The Legislature shall make such appropriations from the Legislature's operating budget, as limited by Section 7.5 of Article IV, as necessary to provide the panel of Special Masters with equipment, office space, and necessary personnel, including counsel and

Section

SUBJECT TO COURT
ORDERED CHANGES

independent experts in the field of redistricting and computer technology, to assist them in their work. The Legislative Analyst shall determine the maximum amount of the appropriation, based on one-half the amount expended by the Legislature in creating plans in 2001, adjusted by the California Consumer Price Index. For purposes of the plan of redistricting under subdivision (b) only, there is hereby appropriated to the panel of Special Masters from the General Fund of the State during the fiscal year in which the panel performs its responsibilities a sum equal to one-half the amount expended by the Legislature in creating plans in 2001. The expenditure of funds under this appropriation shall be subject to the normal administrative review given to other state appropriations. For purposes of all plans of redistricting under subdivision (a), until appropriations are made, the Legislative Analyst's Office, or any successor thereto, shall furnish, from existing resources, staff and services to the panel as needed for the performance of its duties.

(k) Except for judicial decrees, the provisions of this article are the exclusive means of adjusting the boundary lines of the districts specified hereinafter and the powers under Sections 8 and 9 of Article II shall be used only in the manner specified in subdivisions (a) and (b) herein. 9

Section 2. (a) Each member of the Senate, Assembly, Congress, and the Board of Equalization shall be elected from a single-member district. Districts of each type shall be numbered consecutively commencing at the northern boundary of the state and ending at the southern boundary.

(b) The population of all districts of a particular type shall be as nearly equal as practicable. For Congressional districts, the maximum population deviation between districts shall not exceed federal constitutional standards. For state legislative and Board of Equalization districts, the maximum population deviation between districts of the same type shall not exceed one percent or any stricter standard required by federal law.

(c) Districts shall comply with any additional requirements of the United States Constitution and any applicable federal statute, including the federal Voting Rights Act.

(d) Each Board of Equalization district shall be comprised of ten¹⁰ adjacent Senate districts and each Senate district shall be comprised of two adjacent Assembly districts.

(e) Every district shall be contiguous.

(f) District boundaries shall conform to the geographic boundaries of a county, city, or city and county to the greatest extent practicable. In this regard, a redistricting plan shall comply with these criteria in the following order of importance: (1) create the most whole counties possible, (2) create the fewest county fragments possible, (3) create the most whole cities

SUBJECT TO COURT
ORDERED CHANGES

possible, and (4) create the fewest city fragments possible, except as necessary to comply with the requirements of the preceding subdivisions of this section.

(g) Every district shall be as compact as practicable except to the extent necessary to comply with the requirements of the preceding subdivisions of this section. With regard to compactness, to the extent practicable, a contiguous area of population shall not be bypassed to incorporate an area of population more distant.

(h) No census block shall be fragmented unless required to satisfy the requirements of the United States Constitution.

(i) No consideration shall be given as to the potential effects on incumbents or political parties. No data regarding the residence of an incumbent or of any other candidate or the party affiliation or voting history of electors may be used in the preparation of plans, except as required by federal law.

Section 3. Any action or proceeding alleging that a plan adopted by the Special Masters does not conform with the requirements of this article must be filed within 45 days of the filing of the plan with the Secretary of State or such action or proceeding is forever barred. Judicial review of the conformity of any plan with the requirements of this article may be pursuant to a petition for extraordinary relief. If any court finds a plan to be in violation of this article, it may order that a new plan be adopted by a panel of Special Masters pursuant to this article. A court may order any remedy necessary to effectuate this article.

Section 1. In the year following the year in which the national census is taken under the direction of Congress at the beginning of each decade, the Legislature shall adjust the boundary lines of the Senatorial, Assembly, Congressional, and Board of Equalization districts in conformance with the following standards:

- ¶ (a) Each member of the Senate, Assembly, Congress, and the Board of Equalization shall be elected from a single member district.
- ¶ (b) The population of all districts of a particular type shall be reasonably equal.
- ¶ (c) Every district shall be contiguous.
- ¶ (d) Districts of each type shall be numbered consecutively commencing at the northern boundary of the state and ending at the southern boundary.
- ¶ (e) The geographical integrity of any city, county, or city and county, or of any geographical region shall be respected to the extent possible without violating the requirements of any other subdivision of this section.

SUBJECT TO COURT
ORDERED CHANGES

SECTION 3. Severability *g*

If any provision of this measure or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, including, but not limited to, Section 1 of subdivision (b) of Article XXI, that invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications which can reasonably be given effect in the absence of the invalid provision or application.

SECTION 4. Conflicting Ballot Measures *g*

(a) In the event that this measure and another measure or measures relating to the redistricting of Senatorial, Assembly, Congressional, or Board of Equalization districts is approved by a majority of voters at the same election, and this measure receives a greater number of affirmative votes than any other such measure or measures, this measure shall control in its entirety and said other measure or measures shall be rendered void and without any legal effect. If this measure is approved but does not receive a greater number of affirmative votes than said other measure or measures, this measure shall take effect to the extent permitted by law.

(b) If this measure is approved by voters but superseded by law by any other conflicting ballot measure approved by the voters at the same election, and the conflicting ballot measure is later held invalid, this measure shall be self-executing and given full force of law.

~~Dec. 40204420~~

SUBJECT TO COURT
ORDERED CHANGES